public policy like this, it was a most ungenerous turn to give to the debate, to make it personal to the Secretary of State. I shall, like the gentleman from Massachusetts who has just taken his seat, [Mr. Ashman,] not attempt his defence. know nothing of the circumstances which have been referred to; but I am sure every gentleman, of every party, will agree with me, that public reputation is public property; that the fame of a great man is not to be thrown away idly; that a good name is to be valued above all price; and that extraordinary, groundless, and malignant charges are not to be thrown out in a body like this (which the eyes of the world behold) without being replied to with something at least like severity, if not with indignation. A splendid reputation that honors the country, to say the least of it-a splendid reputation, that throws its lustre about the American name-the golden orb of which is already setting beneath the horizon of time, is an effect too much admired by me, at least, to be willing to see a single speck placed upon it by any malignant hand. If I could, sir, I would send down the fame of every great American citizen, of every party, to the grave, without living amongst us, I care not how fierce the rivalry of party may have been, or how heated the contest into which we have been plunged-there is not an illustrious living American that I do not desire to see preserve throughout his life an untarnished fame, and, at the close of his career, sleep in an honored grave. And I ask whether this committee will hear with patience charges so unnecessarily, and I believe I may say so recklessly, thrown out against the reputation of that

Mr. Chairman, I must be allowed to say, that I believe much of the hostility that comes from that quarter is due to the fact, that in the time which just gone by, when a cloud hung over the fortunes of this country which threw its portentous and threatening aspect over the whole heavens-I say, it was because at that time, when good men began to tremble for the fate of the Gov ment, and bad men began to hope it would be overthrown-it was because that, at that moment, this great man took the responsibility of breasting the tide which was setting against the institutions of the country-I must believe, I say, that it was because he lent himself to the great task of resisting the legions which were bearing down sgainst the rights of the South, and put every-thing at stake for his country, that he has been assailed as he has been to-night by the insinuations which have been so grossly made against

Mr. Allen. Will the gentleman yield me the floor for a moment?

Mr. Hilliard. No, sir; I must be excused. I

our history with so much peril to himself that he encountered the hostility which has expended itself this evening. The world will come to this conclusion. He placed everything at stake for the cause of his country, and notwithstanding attacks of this kind against him, the fame which was resplendent before, will go down to posterity with a still richer lustre than it could have ob-tained but for the courage which he displayed upon that occasion. He stands out before the eyes of mankind now in a more glorious and far grander position than he could have occupied but for the stand which he took at that darkest moment of our fortunes. For one, as an American, I thank him for his courage; as a Southern man. I am grateful to him for his sel'-sacrificing patriotism; and I believe his name will be recorded upon the pages of the history of our times in the largest capitals, and in the noblest terms. Mas sachusetts may repudiate him-(I do not believe fame, and will stand by her great son)—but if she were to repudiate him, the country would take him up. He is in no danger. He stands stronger to-day in the affections of his country men than he ever stood before. Such shafts can

not reach him.

Among the first acts of my public life in this Hall, was the defence of that great statesman. I rejoice that, by a piece of good fortune, one of the last acts of my public career should be the same. I have had but one opinion of him from the beginning to the end. He rises like some tall cliff in our midst . he must have mists and shadows at his feet, but eternal sunshine gilds his noble brow. I admit that now the heavens are crowded with constellations which adorn it, but every man when he looks back to that period to which I have referred, must remember how dark the darkness was Webster. Since that time others have arisen above the horizon, but he will ever wear the great honor of emerging first, with splendor, from the gloom which over

Mr. Chairman, I felt that it was due from m to this illustrous statesman, that as I commenced my Congressional career, so I shall close it with the expression of my high admirates or min. I believe that he is upright. I believe on far as the public councils of this country can bear witness or mis course, it has been above suspicion. Every act has been for his country. I believe has no higher wish than the one which he so nobly and eloquently expressed in his own great speech, that "When his eyes shall be turned to behold, for the last time, the sun in heaven, he might not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on States dissovered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil fouds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood! Let their last feeble and lingering glance, rather, behold the gorgeous ensign of the Republic, now known and honored throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their original lustre, not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a single star obscured, bearing for its motto no such mis erable interregatory as, What is all this worth? Nor those other words of delusion and folly, Lib-erty first, and Union afterwards; but everywhere, spread all over in characters of living light, blaz ing on all its ample folds, as they float over the the whole heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart-Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable

Wednesday morning, the subject was resumed We make up our reports from the columns of the Intelligencer and Republic Mr. King of New Jersey, having addressed the

Committee in relation to the subject under consid-Mr. Allen of Massachusetts asked the con sent of the House to indulge him in a few re-The Chairman said that the debate was now

closed, and unanimous consent must be obtained.

Mr. Ashmun expressed the hope that universal consent would be given to his colleague.

The Chairman said that he heard no objection

Mr. Jones. Does it require unanimous cor The Chairman called to order, the confusion in

the hall being great at this time. Mr. Allen. In the course of my remarks last

Mr. Casey. I object to the gentleman proceed-The Chairman. The gentleman has three or four minutes, the time for closing the debate not having quite arrived.

Mr. Allen. I hope that the House will not deny me a simple act of justice. [Cries of "Go on,"
"go on"] I had occasion—
Mr. Thompson of Mississippi called to order,

as it was impossible to hear what was going on. The Chairman rapped, requesting gentlemen to take their seats, especially those standing in front of the Clerk's table and in the aisles. Mr. Casey rose to a point of order. It was, that

the gentleman from New Jersey Mr. King could not yield the floor to the gentleman from Massaetts to make a speech. It required unanimous consent, and he objected.

to exclude the truth from the ear of the House, and that I will not be again interrupted. ["Go on," "go on," "I object." The confusion, if poswas increased

Mr. Casey. I rise to another question of order It is, that the gentleman has already spoken, and that he cannot again take the floor until others

The Chairman said that no other gentleman had contested the floor. ["Go on, Allen, go

Mr. Allen then alluded to what he said last night as to Mr. Webster baving, as a condition for taking the office of Secretary of State, demanded the sum of fifty thousand dollars from business men in Wall street, New York, and State street, Boston. And how, he asked, had this statement been met? Not at all. He did not distinctly hear

the enunciation of his colleague, [Mr. Ashmun,] and he could not speak in the broken accents of that gentleman. But notwithstanding a member of this House, on his responsibility, stated a grave fact, one gentleman, and then another, rose last night, and endeavored to divert the attention

time to which the debate was limited had expired. [Cries of "Go on."] The gentleman could proceed only by unanimous consent. [Repetition of

Mr. Cartter rose to a question of order, amid the confusion. Members had gathered in the area, and private conversation was loudly indulged. Several gentlemen addressed the Chairman, who refused to recognise any one until order should be restored. He then rapped and resorted to a request that gentlemen would resume their scats. Mr. Cartter rose to a question of order—that Mr. Bayly had no right to yield the floor to Mr.

Mr. Bayly. I never pretended that I had. Mr. Cartter. I don't say that.
Mr. Bayly. I was quite aware if it. I yielded to the gentleman, [Mr. Ashmur.] supposing that

there was no objection.

Mr. Burt. I wish to make a suggestion. I understand that the gentleman from Virginia does not desire to occupy the floor for more than fifteen minutes. I propose, by unanimous consent, that twenty minutes of the hour be given to each of the gentlemen from Massachusetts.

It was agreed to, and Mr. Allen was invited to go on"
Mr. Allen then proceeded with his remarks He said that he had stated that no denial had been made of the truth of his statement. He wished his colleague to deny it now, that he might have an opportunity to state a few facts. His coleague declined, at least the House might so unestand him. Did his colleague mean to say

that he had made a denial of the statement last night? If he did, he would meet that denial: and he would here say, that if there was a denial from a responsible source, he would be ready to meet the issue, whenever and wherever it could be presented; and all he asked of the Secretary of tate, or of his friends, was that they would give him an opportunity to call up the evidence and bring forward the facts. He here pledged himself before the committee, notwithstanding any denial which might be made, that, if an opportunity was afforded him, he would substantiate these facts This was the statement which he made: That the Secretary of State did write a letter to Boston. after the offer had been made him of Secretary of State, and did ask what they would do for him if he accepted the office. He did take the office, and t was agreed to raise the sum of \$25,000 in Boston and a like sum in New York. The sum of \$25,000, he believed, was raised in New York, but fell short somewhat in Boston, the sum collected there amounting to \$19,600. He who stood in the office of Secretary of State, having such an arrangement with business men and bankers, was not the most suitable person for the management of the pecuniary negotiations of the country. It made no dif-ference if this money had been offered voluntari-

ly. Every one knew for what purposes commer-cial men made such gifts. Any man of independent spirit, in that position, ought to have said that he would have nothing to do with this thing. He say that I cannot but believe that it was because of the grand and patriotic position into which that statesman threw himself at that moment in. He asked if such influences, brought to bear on that officer, were not dangerous to the public justice and public interests, and more especially dan-gerous when pecuniary concerns to a large amount

should be place! in his charge? His colleague had said that he [Mr. Allen] had een sent here for the cause of human liberty and certain other purposes; and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hilliard] had chimed in and sung the same song. This was only done for the pure of diverting the ear of the House against the truth, by creating a prejudice against the speaker by bringing up other considerations. Whatever might be his opinions at home or here, he would say that his course was frank, open, and undisguised. He published his speeches as he made them, and did not write out one speech for the South and another for the North. He was not in-trusive with his opinions here. The reflections nade upon him, so far from answering the purcoses of his colleague and confederate, must retrue issue by attempting to smother the matter, by exciting party prejudices. He referred to a coalition existing in his colleague's district, and said that it was brought together by party inter-

It had been said, as another argument against

his remarks, that whatever had been done by or for the Secretary of State should not be touched exposed, however the public interests demanded it, because he was a great man. This was the argument of the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. Hilliard, who was dazzled by visions of a foreign mission. He should have admired that gentleman's remarks as much as his friend from South Carolina, [Mr. Holmes] if he had not a distaste for bringing together fragments of speeches and parts of sentences, from this orator and that orator, this poet and that poet, living and dead. He thought had been to the feast of languages, and stolen away the scraps. Though Mr. Webster was great, the world had had examples in all ages that great men fall before temptations which the feeble often resist. The example of the "greatest and meanest of men" shows that intelligence and virtue were not inseparable. The most brilliant intellect should be conceal facts because Mr. Webster was a Massachusetts man. He referred to the Otises and corruption were unknown. Men then accepted poverty. Let any man defame the memory of such statesmen in Massachusetts, and he would be the first to vindicate them. Referring to the charge of ingratitude to Mr. Webster, he desired to know what favors he had received at his hands He knew not how cheap a man could be bought. but did not think that the fact of dining with the Secretary of State should close the mouth of though he should be offered a reward by the apoffice, he could not be bought with the price. In onclusion, he stated that at some future time he would take occasion to review the obligations of Massachusetts to Mr. Webster.

Mr. Ashmun thought that the remarks of his olleague scarcely needed a reply. The sense of shame and indignation that shone in every face and which was expressed so audibly last night, was a better and more effectual response than would be any words he could utter. Did not every one mark the indignation felt and uttered all around the hall at the shameless charge made last night? There was not an honorable man in the House who would not, at such a charge, cry shame! shame!" He was coming directly to the point. The gentleman charged last night, and had renewed the charge to-day, that, before accepting the office of Secretary of State, Mr. Webster entered into a negotiation, by which he made a condition that, if he accepted the office, he large sum of money—some \$50,000—and that that contract had been fulfilled, so far as New York was concerned, and nearly fulfilled so far as Boston was concerned. This was a charge of corruption. It was a charge that he had accepted that office for the purpose of favoring men of ousiness, and it was nothing less. He was authorzed to say that, in its length and breadth, in the aggregate and in the detail, it was an unqualified alsehood. He was authorized to say, and upon hat authority did say, that it was an unqualified

Mr. Allen. State your authority. Mr. Ashmun. Now the issue was made; the challenge had been accepted. Let the defamer of the Secretary of State carry out his threats. This was all he had to say; but he would

Mr. Allen. Mr. Chairman-Mr. Ashmun. Take your seat, sir. You will have time enough when I get through. You shall

not interrupt me.

He had now done what he was not authorized now, there could be no mistake about the matter. The gentleman had said, that whatever else he might be, he was characterized by frankness. This would be news to some people in Massa-chusetts. It would be news in the gentleman's own village. It was news to him. If his character had been one of frankness through life, then he had not been informed correctly. of his frankness, that gentleman, with these pur-poses in the deep abysses of his heart, had gone to the hospitable board of Mr. Webster, and there, with his family and friends around him, partaken of his hospitality. He had gone there, smiling, and seeming to be friendly, when there miling, and seeming to be income, were in his heart whisperings of malignity.

Mr Allen rose to a point of order. He had no objection to any statement of the kind; but the statement was entirely false. He had not been in his house this session.

Mr. Ashmun said that the speech of the gen Mr. Ashmun said that the no new impressions. He had not come suddenly to the conclusion an-nounced on this floor. All his life he had proessed frieudship, while in his heart he harbore enmity. The gentleman was frank. He did not publish secret and confidential letters of Charles

Mr. Allen. No, sir; you are a secondrel if you say so.
Mr. Ashmun did not know what Charles Hud-

son would say. The gentleman had been accepting hospitalities, had sat at the board of the Sec-retary, and had smiled, while at the same time a dagger was in his heart, if not in his hand.
His colleague and himself had been colleagues elsewhere. Did they not recollect the scenes of

the Philadelphia Convention? His colleague and himself, through the whole Convention, voted for Webster as the candidate of the Whig party,

so much for that part of the subject.

Mr. A. then referred to the charge of the existence of a coalition in his [Mr. Ashmun's] district, and said that it was of no considerations had most prevailed to give him triumphant votes in his district. his district. He stood here, to-day, proud of the

support he had always received.

He then stated, in relation to the charge of having one version of his speech printed for the South, and another version for the North, that there was no truth in it. He appealed to those who had known him for the six years he had been Congress to testify to the truth of his assertion Mr. Hilliard asked leave of the House to make

an explanation.

Mr. Allen rose to a point of order. The House had allowed him to reply to one personal charge against him. Another attack had been made, and he had a right now to reply.

The Chairman decided that the gentleman had

o right to reply. Mr. Hilliard asked the privilege to make an explanation. He appealed to the Committee to indulge him in a short reply to the attack made upon him by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Objection was made. Mr. Allen rose to a question of privilege, which was, that a personal attack having been made against him by his colleague, he had a right to

reply.

The Chairman did not consider this a privi leged question. The gentleman could only proed by unanimous consent.

Mr. Bayly then closed the debate on the bill before the Committee, by answering the objections made against it. Several amendments were then offered to the bill, and considerable debate ensued, when the

our of half past three having arrived-

Objections were made.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, MARCH 6, 1851

The Committee took a recess until six o'clock

I'm Our paper is occupied this week, to the exclusion of much interesting matter, with the reports of the closing proceedings of Congress. Our readers would not have forgiven us, had we omitted them.

Hereafter we hope to find more room for con munications, and for our literary miscellany.

CAN CRIME BE LEGALIZED?

"The National Era takes the affirmative of this question. In some comments on the proceedings of the Illinois Convention, these sentences occur: 'A legal relation is one which the law allows creates or protects.' Again: 'The legal-coloring is one ching its relation is one ching its relation in the legal of it is established by the lawmaking power of the State, acting under the Con stitution which prescribes its extent and limita-

"We demur to the above sentiment. The proper meaning of the term law, as applied to intelligent beings, is a rule of duty. That which is mmoral is never duty; and, therefore, can never become law, in the true sense of that term. It is not, of course, our intention to deny that men may pass enactments which 'allow, create, or protect' crime. But are those enactments laws? Do they impose the duty of obedience? Does it require a person to obey such enactments, to earn he character of a law-abiding citizen ?"-Free

The Free Presbyterian is rather anxious, we fear, to disagree with the Era. The difference between us is one of definition, not principle. We agree with the Free Presbyterian, that no human enactment can justify a relation, or impose an obligation upon an intelligent being to do an act, which the law of Nature or Revelation forbids. In common with the editors of that paper, and with every man who believes in the existence of a God, we acknowledge the absolute Supremacy of the Divine Law. In principle we agree. Wherein, then, lies the difference between us? In definition—nothing more. The Free Preshyterian defines law to be, a right rule of conduct: one of the essential elements of law, in its judgment, is that—and the gentleman liked quotations—he | the phrases—"bad lans," "wicked lans," "tyrannical laws," " cruel laws," are all misnomers: there can be no such laws. A "bad law" is no law at all. No enactment is law which commands, sanc-

tions, or allows anything wrong. Need we say that this definition is supported by authority, not in conformity with

popular ideas or modes of expression? The word is derived from a Saxon root, meaning " laid, set, or fixed," and means simply a rule of conduct-not of duty, as the Free Presbyterian has it. Human law is a rule of conduct prescribed by the supreme power of the State; Divine law, a rule of conduct prescribed by the Creator. The latter can never be otherwise than just and good, because its Author is always just and good. The former may be short-sighted, Representative of the American people. Even absurd, or unjust, bearing the stamp of its fallible or corrupt author.

Human laws may be right or wrong, humane or barbarous-allowing in one country what they forbid in another, prohibiting to-day, what yesterday they legalized.

Houses of ill fame are legalized in some parts of Europe, but are illegal in some States of this

Polygamy, which was allowed by the Mosaic institution, is a crime under our laws. To deny that it was legal, that is, allowed by law among the Jews, is to deny a fact.

The union of Church and State in England we regard as wrong, a trespass upon the rights of conscience. Is it therefore illegal? Everybody knows that it is established by law.

Once the foreign slave trade was a legal trafficthat is, allowed and protected by law. Now, our should receive from certain bankers in State law regards and treats it as a crime. Its moral character, not being dependent upon human enactment, was just the same then as it is now. It was always a crime against man and God-not not any more a crime now, for being forbidden by law. We repeat, the legality of a relation is one thing, its morality another.

Gambling by lottery, which the Free Presbyterian considers a crime, is legalized in some States. It is useless to deny the fact. The law allows, licenses it. You cannot by any legal process prevent men from selling or buying lottery tickets in such States. The business is just as legal as but it is; and you can make it unlawful, only by forbidding it by law.

So slavery is established, defined, recognised protected, regulated by law in the slaveholding States. Because it is, it does not follow that it to do last night. Having authority to do this ought to be-any more than because it ought not to be, it follows that it is not. Human law has legalized-that is, allowed, protected, established, Slavery-just as it has allowed polygamy, the slave trade, lotteries, gambling, houses of ill fame-but it can no more make that right than these right. Their moral right or wrong depends upon their relations, not to human law, but to the

The Free Preshyterian says that the doctrine of the Era is "identical with the famous (or rather infamous) dogma-'That is property which the law makes property." The dogma is true-and the offence of Mr. Clay was, not in giving utterance to it, but in using it as a reason to justify Slavery-for, he added, "two hundred years of legislation has sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves as property." Two hundred thousand years of legislation cannot sanction or sanctify a wrong-The law in the free States makes the soil and its products, capital, and the productions of capital and labor, property-and in the slave States it makes men, women, and children, property. This | Star pays for his. In other words, should he set is a fact; and it is because it is true, that what the law makes property is property, that we so utterly detest the system of slavery. Our heaviest charge against that system is, that it takes man, who was created a little lower than the angels, and to whom was given dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowl of the air, and the expenditure which the majority of local papers beasts of the field, drags him down to their level,

cannot make human beings property. It does make them property. "The slave is one who is imputation, in some quarters, of being "selfish and imputation, in some quarters, of b The master can sell him, dispose of his person his industry, and his labor. He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master." This is the law, this, the fact, in Louisians. The slave is property because the law makes him property. Of the fact of the law, no one can doubt ; its right or wrong is another question. To show our abhorrence of the law, it is not necessary that we deny its existence: nor does a recognition of its existence imply approval or toleration of the relations it allows or establishes.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

The National Era, in its prosperity, is getting selfish and exacting. It is erasing Free Soil papers from its exchange list, as we perceive by notices in our exchanges, and the Star finally shares the same fate. Wherefore? Simply because we do not find it convenient to insert its Prospectus of (in our paper) between one two columns length, which, at the usual

rates of advertising, would amount to from twelve to fifteen dollars! This we call exacting. The Era, with a circulation of ten or fifteen thousand, could certainly well afford to exchange with all the Free Soil papers of the country, with out making unreasonable exactions upon themand especially, as it is the experience of every Free Soil country Publisher, that the Era trenches upon his own circulation. There will be men do not appreciate the duty which they owe to the local press, and who will unhesitatingly depress its spirit, and dampen its energies, by discontinuing, that they may the more conveni-ently take a distant paper. We have long known the fact that the Era has displaced many of our subscribers, yet we have never hesitated to be just and generous to the Era. We have often spoken of it in terms of commendation, and have never spoken of those things wherein we deemed it de-

Last autumn we inserted its short prospects which we saw in our exchanges, and marked in and sent it to the Era, thinking we had thereby entitled ourself to a continuance of exchange. We were not a little surprised, subsequently, to see a long prospectus put forth, the insertion of which was made a condition of exchange. We at once resolved, having in our judgment done the fair thing, to submit to no such unreasonable exaction—the result is, the Era ceases to visit us.

Though we regard the Era as an able and valuable paper, we do not regard it at all indispensable to our existence. We cannot, therefore, say, as does our friend of the Chardon Democrat, that me must have it, even if me send on in cash the price of subscription! We intend to do no such thing. It is unquestionably true, that we, and other country publishers are too prone to yield to the unreasonable exactions of the metroportion press. It is time, we think, for the country press to assert their rights and their true dignity. In this day of railroad speed and telegraphic communi-

cation, a very extensive metropolitan exchange is not necessary for the country press. The city press has too long given tone to the country press. It is time for the latter to exhibit true independ-Conceding great ability and value to the Na tional Era—conceding great importance to its local position—disclaiming any desire to diminish its legitimate circulation, or lessen its prosperity,

we shall venture the following criticisms:

1. The National Era fails in true sympathy for the country local press, else it would freely offer an exchange to the few Free Soil papers in ex-istence, leaving it to their generosity to make a 2. It fails to secure to the party of Freedom

overlooks and underrates the importance of the local press, and hence fails to discern, gather up, rate, and reflect the local se the country.

3. It is stiff, stately, and painfully dignified, unfortunately imitating in this the aristocratic austerity of the National Intelligencer. Its articles, though many of them able, are too much in the style of stilted, lumbering essays, adapted rather

probably building up a fortune for its editor—but it disclaims being a party organ, and refuses to insert, as such, our national nominations. It is merely the organ of the personal views of the

to a Monthly Review than to the columns of a

4. It falls short of a true reformer, in that it opposes some of the needed results up to the results of the mass or the mass of the nearly all of the rest of the selfish metropolitan press, the Era is opposed to having newspapers carried free in the mails to a distance of thirty miles from the office of publication, lest, thereby, its own circulation may be diminished, and the preponderance be in favor of the toiling, struggling, too little appreciated, and

poorly patronized country press.

With all these drawbacks, its excellences are not few, and its numerous readers can appreciate them. We bear the Era no ill will. We envy not its excellent editor his prosperity. has had his days of darkness and of trial, and we now and we are rejoiced at it on a firm founds. tion, and there is no justice in enriching it, at the expense of many of the local newspapers. Let

each receive a due support.

We beg of the Era no exchange. Let it do that which seems to itself right-we shall be likely to do the same-and shall try to take care

of ourself. other, and appreciate each other's excellences, and common trials, and struggles and difficulties more, and yield less to the overshadowing, com-bined, selfish influence of the metropolitan press, far better would it be for them.

We hope to live to see the day, when the local of true independence of sprit, and of intellectual and moral power sufficient for a successful maintenance of that independence—then it will not have to beg a city exchange, but its reciprocity will

With the exception of the Ohio Star, and one other paper, no Free Soil journal has manifested other than friendly feelings towards the National Era. We do not believe that the editor of the Star is really unfriendly, but he is disturbed by a momentarý resentment.

Towards the Local Press we have never felt or acted unkindly. Its importance we do not undervalue, nor have we ever attempted to trench upon its circulation. Among the considerations that have made us turn a deaf ear to innumerable solicitations to reduce the price of the Era to one the local newspapers, has been a prominent one. By no act or word, have we directly or indirectly any other. You may say it ought not to be; true, disparaged their merits, or betrayed a want of true sympathy with them. As to the exemption of newspapers from postage, within a range of thirty miles from the places of publication, we withdrew long since our opposition to the policy, not because we thought it sound in principle, or beneficial in its tendency upon the local papers, but because they, being the parties chiefly concerned. insisted that it was important to their interests, and we did not wish to stand in an attitude of antagonism to them. Lately, being urged for some expression of opinion on the subject, we frankly stated our views, but forbore to urge them. We would not lift a finger to prevent the wishes of the local press, on this subject, from being carried into effect.

The National Era, it is true, is prosperous, but t has burdens to bear from which the Local Press it did the first year of its existence. The wages of journeymen printers in Washington are higher than in any part of the Union. At the beginning of this year they raised their prices, and, as we have never yet contended with the claims of labor, we cheerfully paid the advance-so that it now costs us fifty-two cents a thousand for our compo sition, probably twice as much as our friend of the up for his paper as much type as we set up for the Era, it would cost him \$32 50 a week, or about \$1,700 a year less, on the single item of composi-In relation to contributions, too, we pay more

than \$2,000 a year for our correspondence-an almost entirely avoid.

As to our exchanges, we have been so liberal as to suffer them to run up to the number of about six bundred, costing us between seven and eight hundred dollars a year. At the beginning of this volume, finding our expenses greatly increasing, we determined to reduce the list, if possible. As it is desirable that anti-slavery and slavery papers should cultivate a better acquaintance, we stopped none of our numerous exchanges in the South : but the o eration of reduction was con-Commodore Richard F. Stockton is elected to the fined chiefly to Whig. Democratic, and denominational papers of the North, which, however valuable in themselves, could be best spared from our table. We intended to continue our exchange with all the Free Soil papers-and if one here and there was cut off, it was by an oversight, or for some reason which we do not now recollect. The Star is under a wrong impression, in supposing that we demanded the publication of our Prospectus as a condition to an exchange. We did not even usk our exchanges to publish it, but simply stated that, should any one choose to do so, it would of course lay us under an obligation to exchange Our friend of the Star will now acknowledge, we are sure, that, if the Era is prosperous, it is also liberal in its expenditures, and that, while

it feels obliged to reduce some of its unnecessary burdens, it is far from being " selfish or exacting? As to the style of the Era, we regret that we have not been able to please the taste of our friend of the Star ; but the poignancy of our sor row is mitigated by the consideration that, in view of the unfitness of our articles for transfer to the columns of the local press, he has really lost nothing by the discontinuance of the ex

Our friend will allow us to correct an error into which he has fallen concerning the Era's position on the Postage Question. By reference to our Prospectus, he will see that it is fully "up to the wishes of the mass of the People" For many years, we have steadily gone for a uniform rate of two cents postage, on letters weighing not more than half an ounce for all distances, for reduction of newspaper postage, and for the abolition of the franking privilege. This is the substance of what the People demand.

A few words on another point. The Star says "It (the Era) is an individual enterprise-one which is probably building up a fortune for its editor—but it disclaims being a party organ, and refuses to insert, as such, our national nomina-tions. It is merely the organ of the personal views of the editor—which views are at all times sufficiently conservative."

Very well. The Era is an individual enterprise Should it build up a fortune for its editor, i would certainly surprise him, but we do not know that any one would have a right to complain. We owe no man anything-we have received gratuities from none-we give every subscriber to our paper a full equivalent for his money-we are under obligations to none, except to those who, from a too flattering kindness for us, or out of pure devotion to anti-slavery principles, have exerted themselves for the increase of our circulation; and the only way of showing our gratitude to them is, by making the Era a consistent advocate of those principles, and as good a paper in other respects as our means and ability will allow. The Era is certainly not a party organ, but it cordially sympathizes with, and sustains, the good and truemen in and out of existing organizations, who constitute the Party of Progress and fisform. Undoubtedly it is controlled by its editor, as every other newspaper ought to be; and is an exponent of his views, for which no. Party, happily, can be held responsible, as he is responsible for no party. But it is not merely an exponent of his views; for, he humbly frusts that a good supply, deliberately handed back, and the he concurs in opinion with the great body of orator resumed his reading. And so the night open, when there is room, to expressions of dis sent from any of his views.

There-we have done what is quite a new thing for us-made a long defence against a personal attack; and now, to show our friend of the Star that we harbor no resentment against him, notwithstanding his "odorous comparisons," we shall send him the Era.

THE REAL DIFFICULTY.

During the debate on the reference of the Pres ident's message concerning the Boston rescue, Mr. Mason of Virginia insisted that the Fugitive law, to prove efficient, must be carried out by the People of the free States with alacrity, diligence, and zeal. Mr. Cass wished to know whether he would have the People turn out, with hue and cry after a runaway, leaving their occu pations for the purpose of arresting him. Would Mr. Mason, he asked, and his neighbors leave their homes and business, to seize a fugitive from justice from a Northern State? The reply was Certainly, if necessary.

Both gentlemen entirely overlooked the radical difference between the two cases. A robber or murderer is an offender against human and divine law. He is an enemy to mankind; and no matter where the act may have been committed, every person has a deep interest in his seizure and punishment. The law of justice and the instinct of self preservation cry out against his escape, and demand retribution. A slave is not a criminal, but, innocent of offence, he is deprived of his freedom. and degraded to the condition of property. Society has suffered no wrong at his hands, has no punishment to inflict upon him, cherishes no resentment towards him. His bondage, even by slaveholders, is regarded as a misfortune, by others, as a grievous wrong. That he should seek to escape from it, excites no surprise, offends against no right, no instinct of Humanity. The attempt vindicates his manhood, and, if successful must demonstrate, even to his owner, his fitness

The citizens of a slave State do not regard the escape of a slave as they do that of a criminal; and how can it be expected that a free State community can feel indignation or concern at such an event? If there be any feeling at all, it is one of sympathy for the fugitive. He has done no wrong, no harm to anybody-his flight is no offence against the laws of nature or of nations—he is doing what every one knows he has

"Mr. Haven showed the letter to Collecte tious-he is doing what every one knows he has a perfect right to do, seeking to escape from a degradation forced upon him in violation of the rights of man, and to secure that freedom which is the birthright of every human being. The slaveholder does not regard him as criminal, for doing what he himself would do, in similar circumstances; can be blame the citizens of a free State for concurring with him in opinion? Here lies the real difficulty in attempting to

enforce any law for the rendition of fugitive slaves. Forget the Declaration of Independence blot out the lights of Christianity, annihilate the instincts of Humanity, convert Man into a Devil, and God into a Tyrant-then, and not till then, shall your Fugitive laws be executed with " slacis exempt. It costs us, this year, on the single rity, diligence, and real "-then, and not till then, item of composition for our paper, \$750 more than | will it be as easy to catch and punish a fugitive slave, as a fugitive felon. Violent resistance is not necessary to nullify

law. We deprecate such resistance, as wrong in principle and injurious in consequences, unless indeed the evil to be remedied has reached such a height, as to justify its opponents in resorting to revolution, and putting at hazard all the great interests already secured by the existing order of things. To render a law inefficient or inoperative in our country, it is only necessary to withdraw from it the breath of Public Sentiment. A slave from Virginia passes through New York on his way to Canada. People give him food, slave from Virginia passes through New York on his way to Canada. People give him food, money, lodging, ordinary charities; tell him the road to the next town—withhold information to his pursuers concerning him. In all this they commit no illegal act, do not even violate the place, and whatever sacrifice he made should be made up to him by his friends. ories, "Go on;" "go on."]

Mr. Ashmun. I suppose that I can speak five minutes on an amendment.

Mr. Bayly. I am entitled to the floor.

Mr. Ashmun. Will the gentleman allow me a moment, in order to make a statement which I was not ready to make a statement which I was not ready to make last night?

Then, there is scarcely a reading room in spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested in the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested in the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of anylaw. But if this exercise of ordinary the country which has not requested the Era spirit of

MASSACRUSETTS.—Another attempt was made a few days since to elect a Senator from Massachusetts. The number required for a choice was 195-Summer received 193, the highest number he has yet received. The election was then postponed till the 10th instant, when it is hoped, Mr. umner may be chosen.

COMMODORE STOCKTON CHOSEN SENATOR.

United States Senate from New Jersey for six years from the 4th of March next. The vote on the final ballot stood-R. F. Stockton, Democrat - - 39 Ford, Democrat -William L. Dayton, Whig - . 32 Randolph, Wkig -Necessary to choose, 39; and the Commodore

CLOSING SCENES.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock, and immediately

esumed the consideration of the River and Har-

Of the proceedings on Monday, we present mere summary.

bor bill. Several test votes showed a clear majority in favor of the measure, but a determined minority opposed it. It soon became manifest that a trial of endurance between the two parties was inevitable. It is a sound principle, that when the will of a majority in favor of a particular measure s clearly ascertained, after sufficient discussion, and after a fair trial of the usual parliamentary expedients to arrest precipitate action, it ought to prevail It is miserable faction on the part of a minority to attempt to defeat it, by preventing any legislation at all. We do not approve of the River and Harbor bill in all its parts. It was the result of "log-rolling" among the members-it was an omnibus, which few could approve, as a whole, but which many were willing to sanction, for the purpose of securing some particular interest embraced in it. Still, it was better that it should pass than be defeated by faction. Its abuses would have been temporary, and the People might have prevented their repetition. But. tolerate the principle, that a minority may make speeches, read reports, propose idle amendments, and demand the yeas and nays, for the eye purpose of wasting time and preventing decisive action by a fair vote, and there is end of Government. Faction is treason, and the more danger-ous, because it avails itself of constitutional forms to break down the Constitution.

From 11 o'clock Monday morning, till 12 o'clock Tuesday, the Senate sat without recess-engaged in a struggle, not of mind, but of muscle. We made our way into the reporter's gallery late in the evening. The reporters had given way to the ladies; the other galleries were thronged, and the lobbies were crowded.

Mr. Clemens of Alabama, with his leg slung over a desk, was reading, in a low, monotonous tone, as a part of his speech, a long speech delivered formerly by somebody else. No one paid any attention to him. Mr. Rhett sat a few seats behind him with his hat on, talking with a brother Senator. Mr. Walker was almost recumbent in his chair, apparently admiring with half-closed eyes the brilliant chandelier suspended from the dome. Another Senator seemed to be aiming with his legs at the same object. To vary the entertainment, a lover of the weed went up to Mr. Clemens and asked him for a quid of tobacco. The orator, interrupting his exercises for a moment, drew out from his breeches' pocket "a chunk," which his brother Senator, after laying in of the American People, and the dignity of Republicanism agreed to postpone the consideration of the bill, for the purpose of taking up the appropriation bills.

The House on Monday returned the Post Office Appropriation bill to the Senate, without

The bill to convert one regiment of infantry into a regiment of mounted cavalry was pasted. The Patent Office Report was ordered to printed-100,000 extra copies of the agricultural part-25,000 of the mechanical part-5,000 for

the use of the Commissioner. A bill for the improvement of our Lighthouse

system was read a third time and passed. Passed-a bill from the Senate for the abolition of constructive mileage; the Senate bill limiting the liability of ship owners; the Senate bill to ascertain and settle private land claims in California; a joint resolution for the distribution of certain books: the Senate resolution anthorizing the President to bring Kossuth and his associates

to this country in a national vessel. Numerous unsuccessful motions were madeamong them, motions to take up bills appropriating lands for railroads-and a motion to take up the French Spoliation bill.

The House was informed that the bills making Post Office appropriation, and reducing the rates of postage, with the House amendments, had been concurred in by the Senate.

Frequent efforts were made to adjourn, to take recess, &c., but they failed.

The Senate was informed by resolution that the House, having disposed of the important business of the session, was now ready to adjourn. The following explanation was made by Mr. Otis of Maine, in relation to the charge against Mr. Webster.

Mr. Otis rose and said: I ask the indulgence of the House five minutes for a personal explanation. The following communication appeared in the Boston Atlas of the 28th ultimo:

"11 McLEAN STREET, THURSDAY EVENING To the Editors of the Atlas:

"In the evening papers of this date, under the telegraphic head, I notice the following item:
"The facts appear to be, that Mr. Webster wrote to the sub-treasurer, Mr. Haven, that he had been offered the Scate Department, but could not accept it, unless his friends would make up Greeley, who at that time told its contents to Mr Greeley, who at that time told its contents to Mr. Oils, a member from Maine, who was present. Mr. Oils has divulged the matter to Congressmen. It is whispered that Peter Harvey brought on the Boston funds, and A. C. Benson, the New York

paper of to-morrow that this statement, so far as it refers to me, is utterly untrue? Mr. Haven never showed me any such letter; I never knew that he had received any such letter, nor have I ever made any such statement to Mr. Otis, or

anybody else.
"Your obedient servant, P. GREELEY, JUN." I did not authorize the publication in the Her-

ald, and it was done without my knowledge. I am not responsible for it in that form. I did repeat a conversation I had with Mr. Greeley, from which the statement was undoubtedly made.

In July last, before the President had formed In July last, before the President had formed his Cabinet, on my return from Maine, having heard it reported that Mr. Webster was to be Secretary of State, I called at the custom-house in Boston, and inquired of Mr. Greeley about it. He said it was reported that there were letters in the city from Mr. Webster, in which he said that the President had offered him the situation of Secretary of State. In a few minutes a stranger to me came into the room, and called Mr. Gree-ley one side, and gave him a letter to read. After reading it, and a few minutes' conversation, Mr. Greeley returned to his seat, and said that the

the letter of Mr. Webster and the reply of Mr. the letter of Mr. Webster and the reply of Mr. Haven are undoubtedly in existence, and their publication will show the matter correctly.

Had Mr. Greeley candidly stated in his note the matter as it was, instead of equivocating upon the expression of "such letter," and "such statement," he would have saved himself any further trouble, and saved me the necessity of this explanation.

THE LAST HOURS.

The majority of the Senate gave way at a late hour Tuesday morning, and the River and Harbor bill was passed -29 to 18. The appropriation bills from the House were

then taken up and passed.

The House took a recess Monday afternoon from half past three to six o'clock, when it met and continued in session all night, and next morning till half past seven o'clock, when it took a recess till nine o'clock. From that hour till twelve. it was in session, constant communications pass. ing between both Houses. At twelve o'clock, they adjourned sine die, all the appropriation bills having passed. The bill for the relief of Mr. Ritchie was not acted upon in the Senate. Other bills failed for want of time.

THE CHARGE AGAINST MR. WEBSTER.

We present an ample report of the charge made by Judge Allen in the House of Representatives, against Mr. Webster, and of the defence by Messrs. Ashmun and Hilliard.

Judge Allen believed, on the strength of evilence in his possession, that a fund of fifty thousand dollars had been pledged to defray the expenses of Mr. Webster, provided he would accept the office of Secretary of State-that of this amount the sum of forty-four thousand had been raised-\$25,000 in New York, \$19,000 in Bos. ton-chiefly from capitalists, merchants, and manufacturers.

We can see no evidence that he brought this natter before the House wantonly, or from malignant motives. The subject under consideration was the bill making provision for the payment of the instalments due to the Mexican Government, and authorizing the Secretary of State to superintend the business. Mr. Allen. supposing that the Secretary might have been laid under some obligation by the reception of the fund referred to, objected to this part of the bill-not impeaching, as we understood him, the honesty of the Secretary, but recognising, as every man must do, that law of human nature which disposes it to reciprocate kind offices.

Mr. Webster is a great man, but greatness annot plead exemption from the rules of propriety which govern ordinary mortals. He has a high reputation abroad, but the reputation of the country rests not upon his merits, but its

by moneyed men in Boston and New York, to enable him to accept the office of Secretary of State, nobody thinks of denying. Judge Allen offered to produce the evidence in support of his statement: the House refused to hear it. Mr Julian, a friend of his, moved a Committee of Investigation: the House rejected the motion. The fact that the money was raised, is universally admitted; it is notorious in Washington; the Webster papers of Boston concede it. The Boston Daily Advertiser says: "It is a transaction in which, if it were proper

o lay before the public a matter that in its nature is strictly personal, all the parties to it might take an honorable pride. If the friends of Mr. Webster, from their estimate of his public services, have voluntarily tendered to him a pecuniary compensation for the sacrifice which he has made by the acceptance of his present office, in the abandonment of the practice of his profes-sion, in which he held the highest rank; and if Mr. Webster, after having devoted the labors of a long life, exceeded in industry, perseverance and the highest intellectual exertion by the la any conclusion, the grave and reverend body, af-fecting to represent preëminently the intelligence feeting to represent preëminently the intelligence ican People, and the dignity of Reman owes to his family, some equivalents for the sacrifices which he has voluntarily made, it is difficult to conceive on what ground either the offer or the acceptance of such an equivalent can be justly complained of."

The Boston Courier says: "It has been for some time a subject of serious thought with many persons of intelligence and weight in the country, to devise some means to provide an adequate support for the State De-partment at Washington. It has been thought not only discreditable to the Government, but not only discreditable to the Government, but highly prejudicial to the public interest, that this Department should be stinted to such beggarly uses of doing the diplomatic honors of this great and prosperous nation, as are afforded by a salary of it housand dollars a year. Certainly, if the work of the State Department is worth doing, it work doing well, and is worthy of being deceasily add for. No one who knows anything of Washington and public business, and to be informed that the salary of the Secretary of State is next to thing as to pay for the labor and cost of holds the context. Now, if it should so happen, that any unitered public-spirited persons in the United State Department about the salary desirous simply that the State Department about the secretary of the state of the salary desirous simply that the State Department about the starved out of it—if it should so happen, we say, that these persons were more than the salary contents of the salary of the salary down of it—if it should so happen, we say, that these persons were more than the salary of the public salary of the salary of the salary of the salary of the Secretary of State Department of public-spirited persons in the United State Department of public spirited persons were the salary of the salary

should so happen, we say, that these persons were to take measures, of their own accord, to meet any pecuniary exigencies arising in this Department, and were to hold their purses in readiness to keep the public servants free from embarrassment—we desire to know whether such a proceeding would not be the control of the ing would not be a citizen-like and praiseworthy Here is an admission of the fact, with elab

rate attempts at justification. We harbor no ill feeling towards Mr. Web ster. His course on the Slavery Question is opposed to all our notions of Right; but we do not assume to question his right to change his opinions, and his conduct with them. Nor have we any disposition to make war on a man's private character, because we differ from him politically. But the transaction referred to does not, in the judgment of Mr. Webster's friends, affect his honor or honesty; and now that it has been brought before the country, it is clearly a legiti-mate subject for public animadversion.

The important question to which it gives rise is, Ought a public servant to be dependent upon certain classes of individuals for support? Can high officer of the Government act with that exclusive regard to great national interests which should stamp his whole course, while under heavy pecuniary obligations to particular interests? Want of room in this number obliges us to

suspend further remarks on the subject. shall resume them next weak. NEW YORK SENATOR -In the New York Sen ate, February 26, the bill providing for the election of a United States Senator was amended changing the time of election to the fourth Mon-

day in March. The vote was 16 to 10. It is believed that it will pass finally in this shape. Suit for Damages -Barton, the Salem bar ber, arrested in mistake as a fugitive, was brought suit against the District Attorney, Lunt, for ma licious prosecution, laying damages at ten thou

sand dollars. JUDGE BAKER of Mississippi has been confirmed by the Senate, as Chief Justice of New Mexico, and Judge Brocchus of this place, as Chief Justice of Utah. They are not ultraist, we believe

on the subject of slavery.

NEW HAMPSHIRE -There is to be an animated contest in the Granite State this spring. The election takes place on Tuesday, March 4th. The rival candidates are as follows:

1st District—Amos Tuek, (Whig and Free-

1st District—Amos Tuck, (Waig)
Soil:) George Kittredge, (Democrat.)
2d District—Anthony Colby, (Whig.) Asa
2d District—Anthony Colby, (Whig.) Asa
Powler, (Free-Soiler;) Charles H. Peaslee
Democrat.)
(3d District—Jared Perkins, (Whig and Free
Soil:) George W. Morrison, (Democrat.)
4:h District—Jonathan Kittredge, (Whig.)
John H. White, (Free Soil:) tienry Hibbard,
(Damocrat.)